

Attorney docker SAT 201

REMARKS

[1] Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 7 are amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

[2] Claims 3, 7, and 10 were rejected under § 102 over Suzuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is requested to consider the following remarks:

Transportation Direction. Below, the Applicant argues that Suzuki does not disclose the feature of attracting work while *being transported*.

The Examiner does not address this, but states that the claims are rejected because they do not recite moving the pickup along a transportation *direction* of the work (middle of page 3). With respect, the Examiner's statement does not relate to the issue of anticipation. The claims are not rejected under § 112 for being too vague (for causing confusion by omitting the direction); neither are they rejected under § 101 for describing something that is unworkable (by lacking directional alignment); they are rejected for having each element that is disclosed in Suzuki. However, the feature *being transported* (as discussed below) is believed not to be disclosed, and the Examiner has not rebutted the Applicant's previous arguments on this point.

Suzuki Lacks Direction. The Applicant previously argued: "Suzuki discloses picking up components from a flexible tape. The tape changes directions and is believed to lack a defined movement direction (see Fig. 15B)." The Applicant see that direction is doubly irrelevant to the rejection, because the reference does not disclose the feature.

Work "Being Transported." The Applicant's work attraction section attracts the work only while it is being transported; claim 3 recites "A work attracting apparatus for attracting work *being transported* in a transportation direction at a transportation speed ... a work attraction section for attracting the work *being transported*" (emphasis added).

The phrase *being transported* limits the claim to just work being transported, not other work. The reason is that "being transported" is an adjectival phrase; it acts as an adjective, and it limits the "work" to work being transported, just as in the phrase "calico cats" the adjective "calico" excludes all non-calico cats.

AMENDMENT

10/809,683

Attorney docket SAT 201

Advantage. This feature of picking up the work while it is being transported provides the advantage that no time is used up in starting and stopping the apparatus. (A relay racing team who passed the baton only after the runners came to a stop would not win races.) The Applicant explains the advantage at page 9, lines 3-13 and page 17, line 27 to page 8.

Suzuki. In contrast, Suzuki discloses that the component 8 is fed to a predetermined component-sucking position, and *stops*; only then is the nozzle 7 lowered; the nozzle sucks up a component while at rest. The Examiner is referred to: Fig. 1, #3, "VACUUM SUCTION AFTER STOPPING NOZZLE"; col. 10, line 21, "The nozzle descends and then stops"; and col. 10, lines 35-67, "FIG. 4 shows a state where the suction nozzle stops ... the component 8 is held by the suction nozzle 7. *Then*, the component 8 ... is moved" (emphasis added).

Related Art. Suzuki is typical of the Related Art discussed by the Applicant at page 1, line 25 to page 2, line 3, and it has the disadvantage recited by the Applicant at page 2, line 19 to page 3, line 3, namely, that time is wasted.

The Examiner is invited to telephone. The Applicant argues above that "being transported" comprises a limitation because it is an adjectival phrase. However, if the Examiner believes that additional claim language is needed to clarify this feature (e.g., "while being transported," or "only while being transported"), then the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss the matter.

Another Feature. When the work approaches the claimed predetermined position, the controller causes the attraction section to drop *while the work is being transported* and it is necessary to use the claimed work detector to detect the work as it approaches the predetermined position. No such features are disclosed by Suzuki.

Reconsideration is requested.

[3] Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under § 103 over in view of McIlwraith. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds above, and on the grounds previously argued, such as the Applicant's argument that "Suzuki discloses vacuum sucking, which is the exact opposite of the pressure blowing McIlwraith teaches, and is also something that McIlwraith teaches against in

AMENDMENT

10/809,683

Attorney docket SAT 201

¶[0007]. Therefore, the person of ordinary skill would not have combined McIlwraith and Suzuki.”

[4] Claims 5 and 6 were allowed, for which the Examiner is thanked. Allowance of the other claims is requested on the basis of the arguments above.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

(717) 426-1664

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax : (202) 408-0924

April 12, 2006
Date

AMENDMENT

10/809,683